to anything we will have it deleted. Even if something is done, it will be some good done to the tenants of Malabar and we would have earned their gratitude.

MR. SPEAKER : I think the Hon. Minister for Finance has moved the motion to adjourn the further consideration of this Bill under rule 78 of the Assembly Rules. Now I will put the motion to the vote of the House. The question is—

"That the further consideration of the Malabar Tenancy (Amendment) Bill, 1956 (L.A. Bill No. 14 of 1956), be adjourned."

The motion was put and carried.

(2) THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE PROCEEDINGS (PROTECTION OF PUBLICATION) BILL, 1956 (L.A. BILL NO. 16 OF 1956).

* SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move—

"That the Madras Legislative Proceedings (Protection of Publication) Bill, 1956 (L.A. Bill No. 16 of 1956), be taken into consideration."

Recently the Parliament passed the Parliamentary Proceedings (Protection of Publication) Act, 1956, with the object of protecting the publication of the reports of the Parliament by newspapers in our country. That Act does apply to the publication of the proceedings of the Parliament only. The privilege extends to both civil and criminal proceedings. The Act does not afford protection, if anything is published which is actuated by malice or which is not for public good. Apart from these two exceptions, the Act gives protection for the publication of all proceedings of the Parliament.

11 a.m. Hon. Members may be aware that the proceedings of the courts of justice are reported in newspapers and if they are substantially correct, the reports are protected by exception (4) to section 499 of the Indian Penal Code. We know that the proceedings before the High Court and the mufassal courts in several cases are being published in newspapers.

Unfortunately, as far as the publication of the proceedings of both the Houses of the State Legislature is concerned there is no protection. When the Parliamentary Proceedings (Protection of Publication) Act, 1956, was passed, this question was also raised in the Parliament. Item No. 74 of the Union List in the Seventh Schedule to the Constitution, deals with the powers, privileges and immunities of the Houses of Parliament. Item No. 39 in the State List deals with the powers, privileges and immunities of the Legislative Assembly and Council. The Parliament thought that since in item No. 39 of the State List the powers, privileges and immunities of the States Legislatures are dealt with, the question of enacting legislation for protecting the publication of the reports of the proceedings of State Legislatures by newspapers might be left to the concerned State Legislatures. At any rate it might not be the

27th September 1956] [Sri P. Rangaswami Reddiar]

intention of the Union Parliament that the publication of the proceedings of the State Legislatures should not be given protection and that the publication of the proceedings of the Parliament alone should be given protection.

I have adopted almost all the provisions in the Central Legislation, Act XXIV of 1956, except the section dealing with "publication for public good". Hon. Members of this House are representatives of the people and they are responsible persons. Whatever they say inside the Assembly has been considered to be good—in the interest of the people—and therefore, in my opinion, it should be good for the people outside the Legislature also. With that object in view I have deleted that clause and I have adopted more or less all the other provisions of the Central Act in this Bill. I do not think there will be any difficulty in accepting the Bill.

The motion was seconded.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion moved—

"That the Madras Legislative Proceedings (Protection of Publication) Bill, 1956 (L.A. Bill No. 16 of 1956), be taken into consideration."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Parliament has just now enacted this legislation. The Government would like to see how that legislation works before they undertake similar legislation at the State level. After all nothing is going to be lost by postponing the consideration of this Bill for a few months or even for a year. Even now, if any unobjectionable matter is spoken, then there is no impediment in newspapers publishing that. But only when objectionable matter is spoken, i.e., when hon. Members give expression on the floor of the Assembly to any objectionable matter, it is only with reference to the publication of such objectionable matter newspapers should be given protection. The point for consideration is whether, even if objectionable matter is spoken on the floor of the House, the newspapers should be given protection in the matter of publishing the same because they are publishing only a bona fide report of what had happened in the House. Therefore the Government would like to see how the Central Act works, with particular reference to the publication of these matters in newspapers. After gaining sufficient experience in regard to this matter, if they find that the Act has worked well it may be possible for them also to initiate legislation not merely as a Private Member's Bill but even as an Official Bill. Therefore, I would request the hon. Member not to press this Bill at this stage but to give sufficient opportunity to see how the Central Act works. Then, if necessary, we can take steps later on for passing this Bill in this House also. Therefore, I request the hon. Mover of the Bill to withdraw it. I am sorry the Government cannot support the measure at this stage.

* SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR: I cannot agree with the views of the Hon. Leader of the House. The proceedings of the House are printed by the Government in the Government Press

[Sri P. Rangaswami Reddiar] [27th September 1956

and they are released for public sale. Whatever we say in the House are printed in the proceedings and they are made available for public sale. The only unfortunate thing is that the proceedings are made available to the public three or four months after the discussions take place.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : I am sorry the hon. Member does not see the other obvious difference, namely, that only very few persons like hon. Members would look into the printed proceedings while on the other hand millions of people would read the newspaper reports.

* SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR : May I know whether it is the object of the Government that the proceedings of the House should not be read by the public? In a true democracy . . .

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Only if it is objectionable.

MR. SPEAKER : May I know whether the hon. Member is withdrawing his motion?

SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR : Sir, I am not withdrawing it.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

"That the Madras Legislative Proceedings (Protection of Publication) Bill, 1956 (L.A. Bill No. 16 of 1956), be taken into consideration."

The motion was put and lost.

(3) THE DEVOLUTION OF STHANAM PROPERTIES MANAGEMENT BILL, 1956 (L.A. BILL NO. 17 FO 1956).

* SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move—

"That the Devolution of Sthanam Properties Management Bill, 1956 (L.A. Bill No. 17 of 1956), be taken into consideration."

This Bill has become necessary to meet the situation arising out of the Hindu Code Bill. Sir, Sthanams are institutions mainly prevalent in Malabar. There are a good number of them and some of them are very rich institutions holding extensive properties. The main characteristic of this institution is that the eldest member of a Tharvad or of different Tharvads enjoys the income from the institution for his lifetime. His position in some judicial decisions has been compared to that of a 'widow's estate'. There has been some opinion growing whether in a socialistic pattern of society these institutions should be allowed to continue and whether they should not go into dissolution.

11-10 a.m. Sir, sub-section (3) of section 7 of the Hindu Succession Act, 1956, dealing with intestate succession, runs thus :

"Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (1), when a Sthanamdar dies after the commencement of this Act, the